Ultrastrong-coupling QPT phenomena in few-qubit circuit QED system

Wen-Juan Yang[1,2], Xiang-Bin Wang[1,2,3*]
[1] State Key Laboratory of Low Dimensional Quantum Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, People's Republic of China
[2] CAS Center for Excellence and Synergetic Innovation Center in Quantum Information and Quantum Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China
[3] Jinan Institute of Quantum Technology, Jinan, Shandong 250101, China

arXiv:1612.09119v1 [quant-ph] 29 Dec 2016

We consider the system of a few qubits interacting with a single mode resonator in superconducting circuit QED system. We get an effective low-energy Hamiltonian in the limit where the ratio of the qubit frequency to the resonator frequency tends to infinity. In the one-qubit case, three second-order superradiant phases occur and Goldstone mode emerges under the condition of ultrastrong coupling strength. Moreover, a first-order phase transition occurs between two different superradiant phases. In the two-qubit case, a two-qubit Hamiltonian with qubit-qubit interactions is analyzed fully quantum mechanically. We show that quantum phase transition is inhibited even in the ultrastrong coupling regime in this model. In addition, in the three qubits model, the superradiant quantum phase transition is retrieved in the ultrastrong coupling regime. Furthermore, the N-qubit model with $U(1)$ symmetry is studied. We find that the superradiant phase transition is inhibited or restored with the qubit-number parity.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Dicke model, where a large number of atoms interact with a single radiation mode has attracted lots of attention in the studies of quantum electrodynamics(QED) in the cavity and superconductor circuit systems since it was first proposed by Dicke[1–9]. It was later found that in the thermodynamical limit, i.e. the atom number $N \to \infty$, and in the strong coupling regime, the model exhibits a superradiant quantum phase transition(QPT)[10–15]. In the large N limit and the single qubit coupling strength beyond the critical point, the effective coupling between atoms and radiation mode becomes comparable to the bare frequencies of atom and radiation mode, thus superradiant phase transition occurs.

Recently, it has been demonstrated that a similar QPT behavior in the limit where the ratio(ω_q/ω_r) of the qubit frequency to the single-mode resonator frequency diverges[16–23]. Meanwhile, the experimental realization of ultrastrong coupling regime for single qubit and single mode resonator in superconductor circuit systems has been achieved[24–27]. This makes it possible to investigate the QPT phenomena in a single qubit or few qubits level in a controllable circuit system.

In this paper, firstly, we consider a superconductor configuration where a single qubit is coupled both inductively and capacitively to a resonator which induce two different kind of atom-resonator coupling g_x and g_y respectively. The Dicke Hamiltonian which has one kind of coupling terms has discrete Z_2 symmetry. Because the particle non-conserving terms cannot be neglected in the ultrastrong coupling regime, the Hamiltonian does not have $U(1)$ symmetry. However, the Hamiltonian we considered with two different kind of coupling terms preserves continuous $U(1)$ symmetry for $g_x = g_y$. For such a system, we find that three different superradiant phases can occur in the $\omega_q/\omega_r \to \infty$ limit and g_x or g_y beyond the critical points. In particular, in the superradiant phase where $g_x = g_y$ Goldstone mode emerges. Moreover, a first-order phase transition occurs between two different superradiant phases induced by two different discrete symmetry-brokens respectively. Our analysis is in agreement with the study proposed in Ref. [15] in the thermodynamical limit where $N \to \infty$. Secondly, we consider a circuit configuration where two atoms are coupled to the same cell resonator in a transmission line both inductively and capacitively. Qubit-qubit interactions are involved. We find that in this model quantum phase transition is inhibited even in the ultrastrong coupling regime. Thirdly, we consider a model with three qubits. We find that even in the presence of qubit-qubit coupling, the superradiant phase transition is retrieved. Fourthly, an effective Hamiltonian for N qubits is given. For such a system, we find that the presence of superradiant phase transition depends on the qubit-number parity.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we propose an one-qubit circuit QED system. We derive the effective low-energy Hamiltonian and discuss the phase of the one-qubit model. In Sec. III we consider a two-qubit circuit QED systems with qubit-qubit couplings. We derive the effective low-energy Hamiltonian and discuss the phase of the two-qubit model. In Sec. IV we discuss the phase of three-qubit model. We study the QPT phenomena for arbitrary N-qubit system in Sec. V. Finally, Sec. VI summarizes the main conclusions of this work.

*Email Address: xbwang@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn



FIG. 1: Superconducting circuit model with one atom coupled both inductively and capacitively to a transmission line resonator.

II. ONE QUBIT MODEL

Consider a superconducting circuit with one artificial atom in Fig. 1. The artificial atom is coupled both inductively and capacitively(with capacitance C_g) to a transmission line resonator with inductance L_r and capacitance C_r. The atom(fluxonium) consists of a Josephson junction with capacitance C_q and Josephson energy E_J coupled to inductances L_1 and L_2. The Lagrangian of the circuit reads:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= C_r\frac{(\dot{\Phi}_r^i)^2}{2}+C_q\frac{(\dot{\Phi}_q)^2}{2}+E_J\cos(\frac{\Phi_q+\Phi_{ext}}{\Phi_0})\\ &+C_g\frac{(\dot{\Phi}_r^i+\dot{\Phi}_q)^2}{2}-\frac{\Phi_f^2}{2L_1}-\frac{(\Phi_f-\Phi_q)^2}{2L_2}\\ &-\frac{(\Phi_r^{i-1}-\Phi_r^i-\Phi_f)^2}{2L_r},\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where $\Phi_0=\hbar/(2e)$ is the flux quantum and Φ_{ext} is the external flux. By definition, the charge Q_i is conjugate to the flux Φ_i(obeying $[\Phi_i,Q_j]=i\hbar\delta_{ij}$), and hence $\mathrm{Q}_i=\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial\dot{\Phi}_i$:

$$\begin{pmatrix}\mathrm{Q}_r^i\\ \mathrm{Q}_q\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}C_r+C_g & C_g\\ C_g & C_q+C_g\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\dot{\Phi}_r^i\\ \dot{\Phi}_q\end{pmatrix}.\tag{2}$$

By applying Kirchoff's law we can get the relation:

$$\frac{\Phi_r^{i-1}-\Phi_r^i-\Phi_f}{L_r}=\frac{\Phi_f}{L_1}+\frac{\Phi_f-\Phi_q}{L_2}.\tag{3}$$

Applying Eqs. (1)-(3) and the definition $\mathcal{H}=\mathrm{Q}_r\dot{\Phi}_r+\mathrm{Q}_q\dot{\Phi}_q-\mathcal{L}$, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}_r+\mathcal{H}_q+\mathcal{H}_{int},\tag{4}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_r=\frac{(\mathrm{Q}_r^i)^2}{2\bar{C}_r}+\frac{(\Phi_r^{i-1}-\Phi_r^i)^2}{2\bar{L}_r},\tag{5}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_q=\frac{\mathrm{Q}_q^2}{2\bar{C}_q}+\frac{\Phi_q^2}{2\bar{L}_q}-E_J\cos(\frac{\Phi_q+\Phi_{ext}}{\Phi_0}),\tag{6}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{int}=-\frac{\mathrm{Q}_r^i\mathrm{Q}_q}{\bar{C}_g}-\frac{(\Phi_r^{i-1}-\Phi_r^i)\Phi_q}{\bar{L}_g},\tag{7}$$

where $\bar{C}_r=C_\Sigma^2/(C_q+C_g)$, $\bar{L}_r=L_\Sigma^2/(L_1+L_2)$, $\bar{C}_q=C_\Sigma^2/(C_r+C_g)$, $\bar{L}_q=L_\Sigma^2/(L_1+L_r)$, $\bar{C}_g=C_\Sigma^2/C_g$, $\bar{L}_g=L_\Sigma^2/L_1$, $C_\Sigma^2=C_rC_g+C_rC_q+C_gC_q$ and $L_\Sigma^2=L_rL_1+L_rL_2+L_1L_2$.

Quantizing the transmission line resonator mode, we express Φ_r^i as $\Phi_r(x_i)=\cos(kx_i)\sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{\Omega_rC_r}}(a+a^\dagger)$ and Q_r^i as $Q_r(x_i)=-i\cos(kx_i)\sqrt{\hbar\Omega_rC_r}(a-a^\dagger)$ where $\Omega_r=\frac{\pi a}{d\sqrt{L_rC_r}}$, $k=\frac{\pi}{d}$ and d is the length of the transmission line resonator. Note that here we only consider the lowest resonant mode of the transmission line resonator. Further, doing a two-level system approximation for the qubit $\mathcal{H}_q$(with $\Phi_{ext}=\pi\Phi_0$) we can write $H_q=\hbar\omega_q\sigma_z/2$, $\Phi_q=\Phi_0^q\sigma_x(\Phi_0^q=\langle g|\Phi_q|e\rangle)$ and $Q_q=-\omega_q\bar{C}_q\Phi_0^q\sigma_y$ where $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ are the ground state and first excited state of the qubit Hamiltonian respectively. Finally, we arrive at the following quantized Hamiltonian($\hbar=1$)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= \omega_rb^\dagger b+\omega_q\frac{\sigma_z}{2}-g_x(b+b^\dagger)\frac{\sigma_x}{2}\\ &-ig_y(b-b^\dagger)\frac{\sigma_y}{2},\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

where $g_x=2|\cot(kx_i)|^{1/2}\sin(kx_i)\frac{\sqrt{\Omega_rL_r}}{L_g}(\frac{C_r\bar{L}_r}{\bar{C}_rL_r})^{1/4}\Phi_0^q$, $g_y=2|\tan(kx_i)|^{1/2}\cos(kx_i)\sqrt{\Omega_rC_r}\frac{\bar{C}_q}{\bar{C}_g}(\frac{\bar{C}_rL_r}{C_r\bar{L}_r})^{1/4}\omega_q\Phi_0^q$ and $\omega_r=|\sin(2kx_i)|\Omega_r(\frac{C_rL_r}{\bar{C}_r\bar{L}_r})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The Hamiltonian given by Eq. (8) commutes with parity operator $\Pi=e^{i\pi(b^\dagger b+\sigma_+\sigma_-)}$, so that it possesses a discrete Z_2 symmetry. Especially, when $g_x=g_y$, the Hamiltonian is reduced to a J-C model, then it possesses a continuous $U(1)$ symmetry which is invariant under a gauge transformation $e^{i\vartheta(b^\dagger b+\sigma_+\sigma_-)}$.

Here we consider the parameter regime where $\omega_q\gg\omega_r$. In this limit, we can make a unitary transformation $U=e^S=\exp[\frac{g_x+g_y}{2\omega_q}(b^\dagger\sigma_--b\sigma_+)+\frac{g_x-g_y}{2\omega_q}(b\sigma_--b^\dagger\sigma_+)]$. After this transformation, the obtained effective Hamiltonian decouple the low-energy(spin down) and high-energy(spin up) spin subspace. Projecting the effective Hamiltonian to the low energy subspace, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} &= P(UHU^\dagger)P=\omega_rb^\dagger b-\omega_r\frac{\lambda_x^2}{4}(b+b^\dagger)^2\\ &+\omega_r\frac{\lambda_y^2}{4}(b-b^\dagger)^2-\frac{\omega_q}{2},\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where $\lambda_x=\frac{g_x}{\sqrt{\omega_r\omega_q}}$ and $\lambda_y=\frac{g_y}{\sqrt{\omega_r\omega_q}}$. The detailed derivation is shown in Appendix A. Diagonalizing Hamiltonian Eq. (9) we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}=\epsilon c^\dagger c-\frac{\omega_q}{2}$ with $\epsilon=\omega_r\eta\sqrt{(1-\lambda_x^2)(1-\lambda_y^2)}$. Here $\eta=1$ for $\lambda_x^2+\lambda_y^2<2$ and $\eta=-1$ for $\lambda_x^2+\lambda_y^2>2$. Operator b is related to operator c by $c=\hat{S}^\dagger(r)b\hat{S}(r)$, and $\hat{S}(r)=\exp(\frac{1}{2}r(b^2-b^{\dagger2}))$ with $r=\frac{1}{4}\ln\frac{(1-\lambda_y^2)}{(1-\lambda_x^2)}$. It's easy to see that ϵ is image for $(1-\lambda_x^2)(1-\lambda_y^2)<0$. For $(1-\lambda_x^2)(1-\lambda_y^2)>0$ & $\lambda_x^2+\lambda_y^2>2$, the characteristic energy ϵ is negative which suggests that the ground state is unstable and the ground state energy goes to negative infinity. In the above two cases superrradiant phase occurs and Eq. (9) fails to describe the low-energy property. The phase diagram is



FIG. 2: Phase diagram of the Hamiltonian Eq. (8) in the (g_x, g_y) plane.



FIG. 3: Superconducting circuit configuration with two atoms. Two fluxoiums are coupled both inductively and capacitively to the same cell resonator of the transmission line resonator.

shown in Fig. 2.

To investigate the low-energy property, we consider the following transformed Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{H}} &= \mathcal{D}^\dagger[\alpha]\mathcal{H}\mathcal{D}[\alpha] = \omega_r b^\dagger b + \tilde{\omega}_q\frac{\tau_z}{2} + \omega_r|\alpha|^2 \\ &-\frac{g_x}{2}(b+b^\dagger)(\cos\phi\cos 2\theta\tau_x + \sin\phi\tau_y) \\ &-i\frac{g_y}{2}(b-b^\dagger)(-\sin\phi\cos 2\theta\tau_x + \cos\phi\tau_y), \quad (10)\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{D}[\alpha]$ is the displacement operator with $\alpha = \pm\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\omega_q}{\omega_r}(\lambda_x^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_x^2})}$ for $\lambda_x > 1$ & $\lambda_x > \lambda_y$ and $\alpha = \pm\frac{i}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\omega_q}{\omega_r}(\lambda_y^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_y^2})}$ for $\lambda_y > 1$ & $\lambda_y > \lambda_x$. Note that the displacement is $\alpha = \frac{e^{i\vartheta}}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\omega_q}{\omega_r}(\lambda_x^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_x^2})}(\vartheta \in [0, 2\pi))$ for $g_x > 1$ and $g_x = g_y$ as in Ref. [23]. Here $\tilde{\omega}_q = \omega_q\lambda_x^2$, $\tau_z = |\tilde{\uparrow}\rangle\langle\tilde{\uparrow}| - |\tilde{\downarrow}\rangle\langle\tilde{\downarrow}| = \cos 2\theta\sigma_z + \sin 2\theta\sigma_x$, $\tan 2\theta = \mp\frac{2\sqrt{g_x^2|\alpha|}}{\omega_q}$ and $\phi = 0$ for $\lambda_x > 1$ and $\lambda_x > \lambda_y$ while $\tilde{\omega}_q = \omega_q\lambda_y^2$, $\tau_z = |\tilde{\uparrow}\rangle\langle\tilde{\uparrow}| - |\tilde{\downarrow}\rangle\langle\tilde{\downarrow}| = \cos 2\theta\sigma_z - \sin 2\theta\sigma_y$, $\tan 2\theta = \mp\frac{2\sqrt{g_y^2|\alpha|}}{\omega_q}$ and $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}$ for $\lambda_y > 1$ and $\lambda_y > \lambda_x$. Note that here the qubit frequency and qubit-resonator coupling coefficients are rescaled. Doing the same low-energy approximation as that of Eq. (8) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{eff}} &= \omega_r b^\dagger b - \omega_r\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_x^2}{4}(b+b^\dagger)^2 + \omega_r\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_y^2}{4}(b-b^\dagger)^2 \\ &-\frac{\tilde{\omega}_q}{2} + \omega_r|\alpha|^2, \quad (11)\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_x = \frac{1}{\lambda_x^2}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_y = \frac{\lambda_y}{\lambda_x}$ for $\lambda_x > 1$ & $\lambda_x > \lambda_y$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_x = \frac{\lambda_x}{\lambda_y}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_y = \frac{1}{\lambda_y^2}$ for $\lambda_y > 1$ & $\lambda_y > \lambda_x$. Diagonalzing Hamiltonian Eq. (11) we obtain $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{eff}} = \tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{c}^\dagger c - \frac{\tilde{\omega}_q}{2} + \omega_r|\alpha|^2$, with $\tilde{\epsilon} = \omega_r\sqrt{(1-\tilde{\lambda}_x^2)(1-\tilde{\lambda}_y^2)}$. Here $c = \hat{S}^\dagger(\tilde{r})b\hat{S}(\tilde{r})$ with $\hat{S}(\tilde{r}) = \exp(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{r}(b^2 - b^{\dagger 2}))$ and $\tilde{r} = \frac{1}{4}\ln\frac{(1-\tilde{\lambda}_y^2)}{(1-\tilde{\lambda}_x^2)}$. The eigenstates of the system are $|\psi\rangle = D[\alpha]S[\tilde{r}]|m\rangle|\tilde{\downarrow}\rangle$ which implies a nonzero coherence of the resonator field where $\langle a\rangle = \alpha$. Note that in the case $\lambda_x = \lambda_y$ and $\lambda_x > 1$ we have $\tilde{\epsilon} = 0$. This indicates that Goldstone mode emerges.

Our analysis shows that the critical point of superradiant phase transition appears at $\lambda_x = 1$ or $\lambda_y = 1$. The ground state resonator-mode number is $n_G = 0$ for $\lambda_x < 1$ & $\lambda_y < 1$ and $n_G = |\alpha|^2$ for $\lambda_x > 1$ or $\lambda_y > 1$. Therefore, n_G is an order parameter. The ground state energy is $\epsilon_G = -\frac{\omega_q}{2}$ for $\lambda_x < 1$ & $\lambda_y < 1$, $\epsilon_G = -\frac{\omega_q}{4}(\lambda_x^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_x^2})$ for $\lambda_x > 1$ & $\lambda_x > \lambda_y$ and $\epsilon_G = -\frac{\omega_q}{4}(\lambda_y^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_y^2})$ for $\lambda_y > 1$ & $\lambda_y > \lambda_x$. The ground state energy ϵ_G is continuous, while $\partial^2\epsilon/\partial^2 g_x$ is discontinuous at $\lambda_x = 1$ & $\lambda_x > \lambda_y$ so that the normal-phase to the superradiant-phase phase transition is of second order. Analogously, $\partial^2\epsilon/\partial^2 g_y$ is discontinuous at $\lambda_y = 1$ & $\lambda_y > \lambda_x$ which indicates a second order phase transition. Moreover, $\partial\epsilon/\partial g_x$ and $\partial\epsilon/\partial g_y$ are discontinuous at $\lambda_x > 1$ & $\lambda_x = \lambda_y$, therefore the transition between this two kind of superradiant phase is of first order.

III. TWO QUBITS MODEL

The superconducting circuit configuration with two atoms is depicted in Fig. 3. Two fluxoiums are coupled both inductively and capacitively to the same cell resonator of the transmission line resonator. The Lagrangian of the circuit reads:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_2 &= C_r\frac{(\dot{\Phi}_r^i)^2}{2} - \frac{\Phi_f^2}{2L_1} - \frac{(\Phi_r^{i-1} - \Phi_r^i - \Phi_f)^2}{2L_r} \\ &+\sum_{j=1}^{2}[C_q\frac{(\dot{\Phi}_q^j)^2}{2} + E_J\cos(\frac{\Phi_q^j + \Phi_{ext}^j}{\Phi_0}) \\ &+C_g\frac{(\dot{\Phi}_r^i + \dot{\Phi}_q^j)^2}{2} - \frac{(\Phi_f - \Phi_q^j)^2}{2L_2}]. \quad (12)\end{aligned}$$

According to Eq. (12), the corresponding Hamiltonian is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_2 &= \mathcal{H}_r' + \mathcal{H}_q' + \mathcal{H}_{int}', \quad (13)\\ \mathcal{H}_r' &= \frac{(\mathrm{Q}_r^i)^2}{2\bar{C}_r'} + \frac{(\Phi_r^{i-1} - \Phi_r^i)^2}{2\bar{L}_r'}, \quad (14)\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{H}'_q = \sum_{j=1}^{2}[\frac{\mathrm{Q}_q^{j2}}{2\bar{C}'_q}+\frac{\Phi_q^{j2}}{2\bar{L}'_q}-E_J\cos(\frac{\Phi_q^j+\Phi_{ext}^j}{\Phi_0})], \quad (15)$$

$$\mathcal{H}'_{int} = \sum_{j=1}^{2}[-\frac{\mathrm{Q}_r^i\mathrm{Q}_q^j}{\bar{C}'_g}-\frac{(\Phi_r^{i-1}-\Phi_r^i)\Phi_q^j}{\bar{L}'_g} + \frac{\mathrm{Q}_q^1\mathrm{Q}_q^2}{\bar{C}_{qq}}-\frac{\Phi_q^1\Phi_q^2}{\bar{L}_{qq}}], \quad (16)$$

where $\bar{C}'_r = C'^2_\Sigma/(C_q+C_g)$, $\bar{L}'_r = L'^2_\Sigma/(2L_1+L_2)$, $\bar{C}'_q = C'^2_\Sigma/[C_r+C_g(1+\frac{C_q}{C_g+C_q})]$, $\bar{L}'_q = L'^2_\Sigma/(L_1+L_r+L_1L_r/L2)$, $\bar{C}'_g = C'^2_\Sigma/C_g$, $\bar{L}'_g = L'^2_\Sigma/L_1$, $\bar{C}_{qq} = C'^2_\Sigma/\frac{C_g^2}{C_g+C_q}$, $\bar{L}_{qq} = L'^2_\Sigma/\frac{L_1L_r}{L_2}$, $C'^2_\Sigma = C_rC_g+C_rC_q+2C_gC_q$ and $L'^2_\Sigma = 2L_rL_1+L_rL_2+L_1L_2$. Note that qubit-qubit interaction terms are added in the two-qubit Hamiltonian. Doing the same quantizing procedure as in the one-qubit case, we obtain the following Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_2$:

$$\mathcal{H}_2 = \omega'_r d^\dagger d+\omega'_q S_z - g'_x(d+d^\dagger)S_x - ig'_y(d-d^\dagger)S_y - D_xS_x^2+D_yS_y^2, \quad (17)$$

where $g'_x = 2|\cot(kx_i)|^{1/2}\sin(kx_i)\frac{\sqrt{\Omega_rL_r}}{L'_g}(\frac{C_r\bar{L}'_r}{C'_rL_r})^{1/4}\Phi_0^{q'}$, $g'_y = 2|\tan(kx_i)|^{1/2}\cos(kx_i)\sqrt{\Omega_rC_r}\frac{\bar{C}'_r}{\bar{C}'_g}(\frac{\bar{C}'_rL_r}{C_r\bar{L}'_r})^{1/4}\omega'_q\Phi_0^{q'}$, $\omega'_r = |\sin(2kx_i)|\Omega_r(\frac{C_rL_r}{\bar{C}'_r\bar{L}'_r})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $S_k(k=x,y,z) = \frac{\sigma_1^k}{2}+\frac{\sigma_2^k}{2}$. The coefficients D_x and D_y are not independent. After calculation, one finds D_y happens to be $\frac{g'^2_y}{\omega'_r}$ while $D_x = \frac{g'^2_x}{\omega'_r}$ for $L_2 = \frac{2L_1L_r}{L_1-L_r}$. Total excitation number $N_2 = d^\dagger d+\sigma_1^+\sigma_1^-+\sigma_2^+\sigma_2^-$ is not conserved for $g_x = g_y$. Therefore the continuous $U(1)$ symmetry is not preserved. Since $[e^{i\vartheta(d^\dagger d+\sigma_1^+\sigma_1^-+\sigma_2^+\sigma_2^-)}, S_x^2] = -[e^{i\vartheta(d^\dagger d+\sigma_1^+\sigma_1^-+\sigma_2^+\sigma_2^-)}, S_y^2]$, the $U(1)$ symmetry is restored if the sign of D_x or D_y is reversed. Following the method shown in Refs. [28, 29], the sign of the qubit-qubit coupling coefficients can be changed by applying a sequence of local qubit rotations. The obtained Hamiltonian is:

$$\mathcal{H}_3 = 3\omega'_r d^\dagger d+2\omega'_q S_z - g'_x(d+d^\dagger)S_x - ig'_y(d-d^\dagger)S_y + D_xS_x^2+D_yS_y^2. \quad (18)$$

To diagonalize the qubit-qubit coupling terms, spin operators $\sigma_{1,2}^k$ are transformed to fermionic operators via Jordan-Wigner transformation:

$$f_1 = \sigma_1^-, \quad f_2 = -\sigma_1^z\sigma_2^-, \quad f_1^\dagger = \sigma_1^+, \quad f_2^\dagger = -\sigma_1^z\sigma_2^+, \quad (19)$$

where $\sigma_i^+ = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_i^x+i\sigma_i^y)$, $\sigma_i^- = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_i^x-i\sigma_i^y)$. After a linear transformation of fermionic operators, Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3^0 = 2\omega'_qS_z+D_xS_x^2+D_yS_y^2$ can be diagonalized as $\mathcal{H}_3^0 = \Lambda_1\eta_1^\dagger\eta_1+\Lambda_2\eta_2^\dagger\eta_2$ with $\Lambda_i(i=1,2) = \frac{1}{2}\omega'_q[\pm(\lambda'^2_x+\lambda'^2_y)+\sqrt{(\lambda'^2_x-\lambda'^2_y)^2+16}]$ for $\lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y < 4$ and $\Lambda_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2}\omega'_q[(\lambda'^2_x+\lambda'^2_y)\pm\sqrt{(\lambda'^2_x-\lambda'^2_y)^2+16}]$ for $\lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y > 4$. Then Eq. (18) goes to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_3 = {} & 3\omega'_r d^\dagger d+\sum_{i=1}^{2}\Lambda_i\eta_i^\dagger\eta_i-\frac{1}{2}g'_x(d+d^\dagger)[b_{x1}(\eta_1+\eta_1^\dagger) \\ & +b_{x2}(\eta_1+\eta_1^\dagger)\eta_2^\dagger\eta_2+b_{x3}\eta_1^\dagger\eta_1(\eta_2+\eta_2^\dagger)] \\ & -\frac{1}{2}g'_y(d-d^\dagger)[b_{y1}(\eta_1^\dagger-\eta_1)+b_{y2}(\eta_1^\dagger-\eta_1)\eta_2^\dagger\eta_2 \\ & +b_{y3}\eta_1^\dagger\eta_1(\eta_2^\dagger-\eta_2)], \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $b_{x1} = -b_{x2} = b_{y3} = \xi_1$, $b_{x3} = b_{y1} = -b_{y2} = \xi_2$ for $\lambda'^2_x > \lambda'^2_y$ & $\lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y < 4$, $b_{x1} = -b_{x2} = b_{y3} = -\xi_2$, $b_{x3} = b_{y1} = -b_{y2} = -\xi_1$ for $\lambda'^2_x < \lambda'^2_y$ & $\lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y < 4$, $b_{x1} = b_{y1} = 0$, $b_{x2} = b_{y3} = \xi_1$, $b_{x3} = -b_{y2} = -\xi_2$ for $\lambda'^2_x > \lambda'^2_y$ & $\lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y > 4$ and $b_{x1} = b_{y1} = 0$, $b_{x2} = -b_{y3} = -\xi_2$, $b_{x3} = -b_{y2} = -\xi_1$ for $\lambda'^2_x < \lambda'^2_y$ & $\lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y > 4$. Here $\xi_{1,2} = \sqrt{1+\frac{4}{\sqrt{(\lambda'^2_x-\lambda'^2_y)^2+16}}}\mp\sqrt{1-\frac{4}{\sqrt{(\lambda'^2_x-\lambda'^2_y)^2+16}}}$.

In the $\omega_q/\omega_r \to \infty$ limit, make a unitary transformation $U' = e^{S'}$ and the detailed derivation is shown in Appendix B. Being projected to the low energy subspace, the effective Hamiltonian is:

$$\mathcal{H}_3^{\text{eff}} = 3\omega'_r d^\dagger d+\begin{cases} -\frac{1}{4}g'^2_x\xi_1^2/\Lambda_1(d+d^\dagger)^2+\frac{1}{4}g'^2_y\xi_2^2/\Lambda_1(d-d^\dagger)^2, & \lambda'^2_x > \lambda'^2_y \ \&\ \lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y < 4; \\ -\frac{1}{4}g'^2_x\xi_2^2/\Lambda_1(d+d^\dagger)^2+\frac{1}{4}g'^2_y\xi_1^2/\Lambda_1(d-d^\dagger)^2, & \lambda'^2_x < \lambda'^2_y \ \&\ \lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y < 4; \\ 0, & \lambda'^2_x > \lambda'^2_y \ \&\ \lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y > 4; \\ & \lambda'^2_x > \lambda'^2_y \ \&\ \lambda'^2_x\lambda'^2_y > 4. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Diagonalizing the Hamiltonian, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{H}_3^{\rm eff} = \varpi h^\dagger h = \begin{cases} 3\omega_r'\sqrt{(1-\frac{D_x\xi_1^2}{3\Lambda_1})(1-\frac{D_y\xi_2^2}{3\Lambda_1})}h^\dagger h, & \lambda_x'^2 > \lambda_y'^2 \ \&\ \lambda_x'^2\lambda_y'^2 < 4; \\ 3\omega_r'\sqrt{(1-\frac{D_x\xi_2^2}{3\Lambda_1})(1-\frac{D_y\xi_1^2}{3\Lambda_1})}h^\dagger h, & \lambda_x'^2 < \lambda_y'^2 \ \&\ \lambda_x'^2\lambda_y'^2 < 4; \\ 3\omega_r' h^\dagger h, & \lambda_x'^2 > \lambda_y'^2 \ \&\ \lambda_x'^2\lambda_y'^2 > 4; \\ & \lambda_x'^2 > \lambda_y'^2 \ \&\ \lambda_x'^2\lambda_y'^2 > 4. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$



FIG. 4: Phase diagram of three qubits model in the (g_x'', g_y'') plane.

Here ϖ is real and positive. Consequently, the phase transition is inhibited even in the ultrastrong coupling regime.

IV. THREE QUBITS MODEL

The Hamiltonian for the three-qubit model is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_4 &= 3\omega_r'' d'^\dagger d' + 2\omega_q'' S_z' - g_x''(d'+d'^\dagger)S_x' \\ &\quad -ig_y''(d'-d'^\dagger)S_y' + D_x' S_x'^2 + D_y' S_y'^2, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $S_j(j=x,y,z) = \Sigma_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i^j$. In the $\omega_q/\omega_r \to \infty$ limit, applying second-order perturbation theory, we obtain an effective Hamiltonian and we can get a phase diagram as shown in Fig. 4. It is easy to see that the superradiant phase is restored.

V. DISCUSSION

Obviously, our results can be extended to the N-qubit situation where $g_x = g_y$. The Hamiltonian for N-qubit model is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_N &= \mathcal{H}_0^{(N)} + \mathcal{V}^{(N)}, \\ \mathcal{H}_0^{(N)} &= 3\Omega_r t^\dagger t + 2\Omega_q J_z + DJ_x^2 + DJ_y^2, \\ \mathcal{V}^{(N)} &= -g(t+t^\dagger)J_x - ig(t-t^\dagger)J_y. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The qubits Hamiltonian can be diagonalized as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{0q}^{(N)} &= 2\Omega_q J_z + D(J^2 - J_z^2) = [2\Omega_q m_z \\ &\quad + D(j(j+1) - m_z^2)]|j,m_z\rangle\langle j,m_z|, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where J is the total angular momentum of qubits, spin number $j = 0, 1, 2, .., \frac{N}{2}(N$ is even) or $j = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, .., \frac{N}{2}(N$ is odd) and projection number $m_z = -j, -j+1, ..., j$. Ground state is $|\frac{N}{2}, -\frac{N}{2}\rangle$ for $D < 2\Omega_q$. For $D > 2\Omega_q$, ground state is $|0,0\rangle$ for $N \in$ even and $|\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle$ for $N \in$ odd. In the $\Omega_q/\Omega_r \to \infty$ limit, the effective Hamiltonian of Eq. (24) goes to:

$$\mathcal{H}_N^{\rm eff} = \begin{cases} 3\Omega_r(1-\frac{N\lambda}{3[(N-1)\lambda+2]})t^\dagger t, & \lambda > 2; \\ 3\Omega_r t^\dagger t, & \lambda < 2 \ \&\ N \in \text{even}; \\ 3\Omega_r(1-\frac{\lambda}{6})t^\dagger t, & \lambda < 2 \ \&\ N \in \text{odd}. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

We can easily see that when N is even, phase transition is inhibited. However, when N is odd, superradiant phase transition occurs in the ultrastrong coupling regime and the phase-transition point is $\lambda = 6$.

VI. CONCLUSION

In summary, firstly, we made a fully quantum mechanical analysis of the one-qubit Hamiltonian by using an

effective low-energy theory in the limit $\omega_q/\omega_r \to \infty$. Second-order superradiant phase occurs and Goldstone mode emerges in this limit. In addition, a first-order phase transition occurs between two different superradiant phases. Secondly, a two-qubit Hamiltonian beyond Dicke model is analyzed fully quantum mechanically. We show that quantum phase transition is inhibited even in the ultrastrong coupling regime in this model. Thirdly, a three-qubit model is analyzed and the QPT is restored. Finally, we extend our results to N qubits case.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge A. Li for helpful discussion. We acknowledge the financial support in part by the 10000-Plan of Shandong province (Taishan Scholars), NSFC grant No. 11174177 and 60725416, Open Research Fund Program of the State Key Laboratory of Low-Dimensional Quantum Physics Grant No. KF201513; and the key R&D Plan Project of Shandong Province, grant No. 2015GGX101035.

Appendix A: derivation of Eq. (9)

The one-qubit Hamiltonian Eq. (8) is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= \mathcal{H}_0+\mathcal{V},\\ \mathcal{H}_0 &= \omega_r b^\dagger b+\omega_q\frac{\sigma_z}{2},\\ \mathcal{V} &= -g_x(b+b^\dagger)\frac{\sigma_x}{2}-ig_y(b-b^\dagger)\frac{\sigma_y}{2}. \end{aligned}\quad (A1)$$

Here $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are block-diagonal and block-off-diagonal with respect to spin subspace. We use an effective low-energy theory shown in Ref. [22] for a fully quantum mechanical analysis of the Hamiltonian. We consider a unitary transformation $U=e^S$ where S is anti-Hermitian. The transformed Hamiltonian reads:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}' &= e^S\mathcal{H}e^{-S}=\mathcal{H}_0+\mathcal{V}+[S,\mathcal{H}_0+\mathcal{V}]\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2!}[S,[S,\mathcal{H}_0+\mathcal{V}]]+....\end{aligned}\quad (A2)$$

We require that the block-off-diagonal terms maintain zero up to second order of g_x and g_y, then

$$[S_1,\mathcal{H}_0]=-\mathcal{V}. \quad (A3)$$

With this requirement, we find the generator S is

$$\begin{aligned}S &= S_1=\frac{g_x+g_y}{2\omega_q}(b^\dagger\sigma_- - b\sigma_+)+\frac{g_x-g_y}{2\omega_q}(b\sigma_- - b^\dagger\sigma_+)\\ &\quad+O((g_x,g_y)\frac{\omega_r}{\omega_q^2}).\end{aligned}\quad (A4)$$

By Projecting Hamiltonian Eq. (A1) to low-energy spin subspace we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} &= P\mathcal{H}'P\\ &= P(\mathcal{H}_0+\frac{1}{2}[S_1,\mathcal{V}])P\\ &= \omega_r b^\dagger b-\omega_r\frac{\lambda_x^2}{4}(b+b^\dagger)^2+\omega_r\frac{\lambda_y^2}{4}(b-b^\dagger)^2\\ &\quad-\frac{\omega_q}{2}.\end{aligned}\quad (A5)$$

Appendix B: derivation of Eq. (21)

The two-qubit Hamiltonian Eq. (20) is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_3 &= \mathcal{H}_{30}+\mathcal{V}_3,\\ \mathcal{H}_{30} &= 3\omega_r' d^\dagger d+\sum_{i=1}^{2}\Lambda_i\eta_i^\dagger\eta_i\\ \mathcal{V}_3 &= -\frac{1}{2}g_x'(d+d^\dagger)[b_{x1}(\eta_1+\eta_1^\dagger)\\ &\quad+b_{x2}(\eta_1+\eta_1^\dagger)\eta_2^\dagger\eta_2+b_{x3}\eta_1^\dagger\eta_1(\eta_2+\eta_2^\dagger)]\\ &\quad-\frac{1}{2}g_y'(d-d^\dagger)[b_{y1}(\eta_1^\dagger-\eta_1)\\ &\quad+b_{y2}(\eta_1^\dagger-\eta_1)\eta_2^\dagger\eta_2+b_{y3}\eta_1^\dagger\eta_1(\eta_2^\dagger-\eta_2)],\end{aligned}\quad (B1)$$

Hamiltonians $\mathcal{H}_{30}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{30}$ are block-diagonal and block-off-diagonal with respect to spin subspace. We again consider a unitary transformation $U'=e^{S'}$ where S' is anti-Hermitian. The transformed Hamiltonian reads:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_3' &= e^{S'}\mathcal{H}_3e^{-S'}=\mathcal{H}_{30}+\mathcal{V}_3+[S',\mathcal{H}_{30}+\mathcal{V}_3]\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2!}[S',[S',\mathcal{H}_{30}+\mathcal{V}_3]]+....\end{aligned}\quad (B2)$$

With the requirement that block-off-diagonal terms maintain zero up to second order of g_x' and g_y', then

$$\begin{aligned}[S_1',\mathcal{H}_{30}] &= -\mathcal{V}\\ \mathcal{H}_{32}^d+\mathcal{H}_{32}^{od} &= [S_1',\mathcal{V}_3]+\frac{1}{2!}[S_1',[S_1',\mathcal{H}_{30}]],\\ \mathcal{H}_{32}^{od} &= -[S_2',\mathcal{H}_{30}],\end{aligned}\quad (B3)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{32}^d$ and $\mathcal{H}_{32}^d$ are diagonal and off-diagonal with respect to spin subspace. With this requirement and projecting Hamiltonian Eq. (B1) to low-energy spin subspace we obtain:

$$\mathcal{H}_3^{\rm eff} = P\mathcal{H}_3P$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= P(\mathcal{H}_{30} + \frac{1}{2}[S_1', \mathcal{V}] + [S_2', \mathcal{H}_{30}])P \\
&= 3\omega_r' d^\dagger d + \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{4}g_x'^2\xi_1^2/\Lambda_1(d+d^\dagger)^2 + \frac{1}{4}g_y'^2\xi_2^2/\Lambda_1(d-d^\dagger)^2, & \lambda_x'^2 > \lambda_y'^2 \ \&\ \lambda_x'^2\lambda_y'^2 < 4; \\ -\frac{1}{4}g_x'^2\xi_2^2/\Lambda_1(d+d^\dagger)^2 + \frac{1}{4}g_y'^2\xi_1^2/\Lambda_1(d-d^\dagger)^2, & \lambda_x'^2 < \lambda_y'^2 \ \&\ \lambda_x'^2\lambda_y'^2 < 4; \\ 0, & \lambda_x'^2 > \lambda_y'^2 \ \&\ \lambda_x'^2\lambda_y'^2 > 4; \\ & \lambda_x'^2 > \lambda_y'^2 \ \&\ \lambda_x'^2\lambda_y'^2 > 4. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{B4}
$$

[1] R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **93**, 99 (1954).
[2] T. Brandes, Physics Reports **408**, 315 (2005).
[3] F. Dimer, B. Estienne, A. S. Parkins, and H. J. Carmichael, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 013804 (2007).
[4] K. Baumann, C. Guerlin, F. Brennecke, and T. Esslinger, Nature (London) **464**, 1301 (2010).
[5] D. Nagy, G. Kónya, G. Szirmai, and P. Domokos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 130401 (2010).
[6] K. Baumann, R. Mottl, F. Brennecke, and T. Esslinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 140402 (2011).
[7] M. J. Bhaseen, J. Mayoh, B. D. Simons, and J. Keeling, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 013817 (2012).
[8] A. Baksic, P. Nataf, and C. Ciuti, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 023813 (2013).
[9] P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 023601 (2010); P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, Nat. Commun. **1**, 72 (2010); P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 190402 (2011); P. Nataf, A. Baksic, and C. Ciuti, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 013832 (2012).
[10] K. Hepp and E. H. Lieb, Ann. Phys. **76**, 360 (1973).
[11] Y. K. Wang and F. T. Hioe, Phys. Rev. A **7**, 831 (1973).
[12] C. Emary and T. Brandes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 044101 (2003).
[13] N. Lambert, C. Emary, and T. Brandes, ibid. **92**, 073602 (2004).
[14] S. Sachdev, Quantum Phase Transitions (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1999).
[15] A. Baksic, and C. Ciuti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 173601 (2014).
[16] S. Ashhab and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042311 (2010).
[17] G. Levine and V. N. Muthukumar, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 113203 (2004); A. P. Hines, C. M. Dawson, R. H. McKenzie, and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 022303 (2004).
[18] M.-J. Hwang and M. S. Choi, Phys. Rev. A. **82**, 025802 (2010).
[19] L. Bakemeier, A. Alvermann, and H. Fehske, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 043821 (2012).
[20] S. Ashhab, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 013826 (2013).
[21] J. Larson, Phys. Scr. **76**, 146 (2007).
[22] M.-J. Hwang, R. Puebla, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 180404 (2015).
[23] M.-J. Hwang, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 123602 (2016).
[24] T. Niemczyk, et al., Nat. Phys. **6**, 772 (2010).
[25] A. Fedorov, A. K. Feofanov, P. Macha, P. Forn-Diaz, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 060503 (2010).
[26] M. H. Devoret, S. Girvin, and R. Schoelkopf, Ann. Phys. **16**, 767 (2007).
[27] J. Q. You and F. Nori, Phys. Today 58(11), 42 (2005); Nature (London) 474, 589 (2011).
[28] U. L. Heras, A. Mezzacapo, L. Lamata, S. Filipp, A. Wallraff, and E. Solano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 200501 (2014).
[29] Y. Salathé, M. Mondal, M. Oppliger, et al., Phys. Rev. X **5**, 021027 (2015).
[30] T. Jaako, Z. L. Xiang, J. J. Garcia-Ripoll, and P. Rabl, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 033850 (2016).